

We know that what the Senator from New Jersey and I experienced up at Exxon Valdez some 20 years ago was not adequate, so that is why we passed the legislation. It should be upgraded. Certainly, we need to raise these limits. Where it should be raised, I don't know. I don't know where the cap should be. We are going to have to find out as this thing moves along.

I would only say this: If you have it up too high, you are going to be singling out BP and the other four largest majors and the nationalized companies, such as China and Venezuela, and shutting out the independent producers. I don't want that to happen. Let's wait and see where that cap should be.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. INHOFE. I would, yes.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the Senator for yielding.

So is it my understanding that because of your concern about these other independents, let's call them, you would allow them—if they were the cause of this incident—to limit their liability just because they are small?

Mr. INHOFE. No. My answer to the question is, as I said, we don't know where that cap should be. You are coming up with a cap that might end up being the appropriate cap for everyone. But my understanding now would be that the only ones who would be able to live up to that cap would be the five majors and the nationalized companies. If that is the case, yes, I would say we need to have that opened so that we are not just allowing the majors as opposed to the independents. But let's wait and see where the cap should be. Maybe it should be that high. We don't know yet, President Obama doesn't know yet, and I don't know yet. That is the reason I object.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. INHOFE. You can ask, but I am going to have to leave here. Go ahead.

Mr. MENENDEZ. If, in fact, it is—I think everybody clearly believes this consequence in damages is at least \$10 billion—some have suggested it should be an unlimited cap. If that is the figure, your concern wouldn't stop you from putting it at that figure and making sure all the independents—

Mr. INHOFE. I would repeat, it is too early to come up with a figure, and I think the President agrees with that. Let's see what kind of cap should apply.

#### HEALTH CARE REFORM

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few moments this morning about a subject that is on the minds of many Americans and I think should still be on the minds of everybody in this Chamber because the health care bill that was passed and signed into

law recently is going to have impacts across this country for some time to come.

I am interested in the discussion that has occurred here on the floor of the Senate over the past several weeks, as Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming—who also happens to be an orthopedic surgeon, a physician—has come to the floor to engage in a series of remarks, what he calls the “second opinion.” I think his second opinion series of remarks here on the floor has been extremely well pointed in illustrating, in many respects, what is wrong with the health care bill and why this is not something that is going to improve the lives of most Americans but, in fact, is going to worsen the lives of most Americans because they will be faced with higher health care costs, higher taxes, and probably higher deficits for years and years to come.

There is a lot of supporting data now, validation of those arguments we heard during the course of the health care debate. The Democrats, who were supporting it, as was the President, said this health care legislation was going to, No. 1, reduce health care costs for most Americans, and No. 2, reduce the deficit. Of course, they talked a lot about how it was going to extend the lifespan of Medicare as well, even though they were cutting Medicare and using those funds to create a new entitlement program. So all those promises made by the President and made by the Democrats here in the Senate when we were debating health care are now all being completely rebuffed by evidence that comes out all the time from those who study this issue closely.

Frankly, as we get more and more businesses trying to figure out how to interact with this new health care legislation, they are coming to the conclusion that it might be cheaper for them in the long run to drop their coverage and put everybody in the government plan, which is what we predicted would happen all along.

But I think probably the biggest bombshell—certainly the most damning piece of evidence—came out just a few weeks ago when the Actuary of Health and Human Services, HHS, came out with his analysis of the financial impacts the new law would have once it was passed and implemented. I wish to share a few things from that report because I think it is very important. It does, as I said before, illustrate exactly what Senator BARRASSO and others said throughout the course of the debate in the Senate when health care was under consideration.

The Actuary of the Department of Health and Human Services—bear in mind, this agency is supposed to look at these things in a totally objective, nonpolitical way—the Actuary concluded that the Federal Government and the country will spend \$310 billion more under the new law than we would have without it. The Actuary's report went on to say that national health ex-

penditures would increase from 17 percent of GDP, which is what it is today, to 21 percent under the new law. But what is interesting about this is that the \$310 billion increase in health care costs they now say will result from the passage and implementation of this legislation is more than what would have happened had we done nothing. Had this body done nothing in terms of health care reform, health care costs would have gone up less than they will with this legislation. As I said before, this completely refutes any argument made by the other side during the course of this debate that their legislation would, in fact, drive down health care costs.

The Actuary has now concluded the point that we made throughout the course of the debate; that is, that health care costs will go up, not down; the cost curve will be bent up, not down; and for most Americans, health insurance premiums are going to go up as a result of this legislation. That is what the Actuary is now saying.

What is even more interesting about that report is it goes on to say that health care shortages and price increases are “plausible and even probable” under the legislation. The report suggests there will be perhaps as many as 15 percent of Part A providers—Part A providers are hospitals—that will become unprofitable within the 10-year projection period absent further legislative action.

In other words, up to 15 percent of hospitals would have to close as a result of this legislation. Because of that, the report says the law will jeopardize “access to care for seniors.” So all these promises about greater access, lower cost—the promises that were made during the course of this debate—are being completely now rebutted by the report that the Actuary came out with just a couple of weeks ago.

The other thing I think is important—we emphasized this as well during the debate—the Actuary concluded that new taxes that are going to be imposed on medical devices, on prescription drugs and insurance plans, were generally passed on through to consumers in the form of higher drug and device prices and higher insurance premiums.

Remember, during the course of the debate we said all the new taxes that will be levied on medical device manufacturers, pharmaceuticals, health insurance plans, would be passed on. This is clearly what they are suggesting as well. So not only do we get the double whammy, we get the whammy of higher insurance premiums, but we get the double whammy of higher taxes that are going to be borne by a lot of people across the country. That also is being substantiated and supported by the Joint Tax Committee, which took a good look at the distribution of the impacts of the tax increases in this bill. A lot of Americans are going to see their tax burdens go up as well.

With respect to the issue of the deficit—which, again, is something I will